26

1								
2								
3	APPEARANCES:							
4	BROWER PIVEN, P.C. Attorneys for the Plaintiff							
5	488 Madison Avenue, Eighth Floor							
б	New York, New York 10023 BY: BRIAN C. KERR, ESQ., Of Counsel							
7	CENTURE ADDO OTATO MONOTION C DIOM IID							
8	SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE MEAGHER & FLOM, LLP Attorneys for Defendants Macandrews & Forbes,							
9	Schwartz, Perelman and Bevins 1100 Market Street #1 Nilmington Dolowsky 18828							
10	Wilmington, Delaware 19899 BY: THOMAS J. ALLINGHAM, ESQ., Of Counsel							
11	WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER							
12	Attorneys for Defendants Byorum, Dinh, Meister and Webb							
13	787 Seventh Avenue New York, New York 10019-6099							
1.4	BY: TODD G. COSENZA, ESQ., Of Counsel							
15	PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON, LLP							
16	Attorneys for Defendants M&F Worldwide, Beekman, Dawson, Taub, Keane and Slovin							
17	1285 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10019-6064							
18	BY: DANIEL J. LEFELL, ESQ., Of Counsel							
19								
20								
21	BARBARA STROH, CSR, CRR, CMR							
22	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER							
23								
24								
25								

Proceedings

THE COURT: This is a class action. Well, it's an action that seeks to become a class action, I should say, and it's a motion to consolidate this case with another case involving the same defendants and the same issues.

There are four Delaware class actions involving the same matter and two New York actions involving this matter.

All the actions were commenced within a one-week period in June of this year, between, I believe, June 14 and June 23.

So it's a little more than one week, but basically all of the actions were commenced very close in time, basically the same time.

At this point the two New York actions seek to be consolidated, and they asked for interim, I guess it's co-lead counsel to be appointed, and there is a cross-motion or -- I guess they are cross-motions.

MR. ALLINGHAM: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Several, seeking to either dismiss or stay the New York actions in favor of the Delaware actions.

I'll hear you.

MR. KERR: Your Honor, we're the plaintiff, so it's our original motion for consolidation.

4 Proceedings 1 THE COURT: 2 Yes. MR. KERR: Brian Kerr, from Brower Piven for 3 the plaintiff. 4 Your Honor, we think it's clear that the two 5 cases are similar. They raise similar allegations, 6 have similar parties, and the defendants' only 7 opposition --8 THE COURT: They meet the New York 9 10 consolidation standard, and they should be consolidated under New York statute? 11 12 MR. KERR: That's our position. 13 THE COURT: That's what your position is. 14 now you're seeking that you and counsel in the Feit 15 action be appointed interim co-lead counsel. 16 MR. KERR: That's right. 17 THE COURT: All right, let me hear from the 18 other side. The other side, I mean when talking about these class actions, basically we're talking about the 19 It's clear that different courts shouldn't 20 same thing. be rendering different decisions. 21 MR. ALLINGHAM: We agree with that, your 22 23 Honor. 24 THE COURT; I mean that's your argument.

26 THE COURT: Your argument is that these cases

Yes.

MR. ALLINGHAM:

25

Proceedings

would be better brought in Delaware, is that what you're, arguments.

MR. ALLINGHAM: Yes, for several reasons, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me hear you.

MR. ALLINGHAM: Your Honor, Tom Allingham,
Skadden, Arps. I represent Macandrews & Forbes, Mr.
Schwartz, Mr. Perelman and Mr. Bevins.

The answer, your Honor, is that both on objective rules which are the general rules in New York courts, that is the first filed rule which is --

THE COURT: Well, you know, let me start by saying in terms of the first filed rule that is not an issue here because they were commenced -- all these actions, all six actions were commenced so close in time, that to this court's mind they were all commenced at the same time.

This is not a race to the courthouse by a day or two. I think the notice of what was going to happen occurred on June 13. Somehow one law firm managed to file on the 14th. Others filed on the 16th, 23th, but, you know, basically it was all the same. So let's ignore that factor.

MR. ALLINGHAM: Let me turn to the other issues, but let's me just say one thing about the first

l

1.3

filed rule. Has the utility of being an objective, clear standard, where there weren't other factors that would distinguish between the two forums. There are --

THE COURT: There are many factors here, so let's turn to those because, frankly, I don't plan on giving out race issues and I think it's not the way to determine this case.

MR. ALLINGHAM: Fair enough, your Honor. I would say that there are two powerful reasons why the Delaware forum is the right forum. The first of these is that the Delaware forum is significantly more advanced than this forum.

We have had in the Delaware case consolidation, establishment of class structure, answers to the operative consolidated complaint, discovery requests, both to the parties and to third parties, and since the announcement of an actual proposal -- and your Honor, I don't know. The papers don't actually because they were filed before it happened. It might be worthwhile to give you 60 seconds of background. The transaction proposal from my client was announced on June 13.

A special committee which is represented by Mr. Madea from Willkie Farr was formed by the Macandrews & Forbes Worldwide board.

б

THE COURT: This was supposedly independent directors?

MR. ALLINGHAM: No question about it. Under any rules, New York Stock Exchange rule any rule these are independent directors. They then retain Willkie Farr as independent counsel and every court partners investment bank to do their own analysis.

For in next call it 8 to 10 weeks of intensive analysis, due diligence, interviews with management, so forth, the special committee and its advisers examined the proposal from my clients.

It was not until last week that final negotiations arrived at a transaction which could be approved by the special committee and ultimately presented to the M & F Worldwide board over the weekend, and on Monday morning a new transaction at a higher price was announced.

Since that actual transaction, as opposed to merely a proposal was announced, Chancellor Strine has entered a scheduling order which leads to -- which sets deadlines for all of the various aspects of the case in and which leads to a final preliminary injunction hearing on December 19 at 9:30 in his court.

So that Delaware case is set up and structured and scheduled to be addressed in a timely fashion,

1.6

Proceedings

before year end, which is what the company have said if everything breaks right, the transaction might close by year end.

In addition to that, Chancellor Strine has considered the question of class certification and a certified class identical, in fact, to the class that's proposed here and certified that class in an order that was entered yesterday.

Plaintiffs here, in fact, are members of that class. Their interests will be protected by counsel representing that class.

Those counsel -- I don't think my friends would dispute that they are equally distinguished on the plaintiff sidebar as counsel here.

So I doubt that they would say that their interests would not be well protected, but if they do, they have an option.

THE COURT: They can intervene.

MR. ALLINGHAM: They can intervene.

THE COURT: That's your argument.

MR. ALLINGHAM: And we know the Court of Chancery is sympathetic to motions to intervene, your Honor particularly where people with come together to litigate in one forum.

So the Delaware action is fully tee'd up to

1.6

accomplish the Delaware goal that, of course, this court could also accomplish, but the Delaware action is ahead of the game.

The second issue is Delaware has a powerful interest in the issues that are presented in this case.

THE COURT: Well, you know, again we're talking here about companies that are incorporated or chartered, they're Delaware companies.

However, they do business in New York. One of them is traded on the New York Stock Exchange. Almost all the witnesses and all the documents are in New York. The plaintiffs, named plaintiffs are New York residents.

New York has a tremendous interest in this. So I don't know if that argument is very strong.

MR. ALLINGHAM: Let me first take the facts that were taken from my friends pleadings or brief and address those.

First of all, one of the two named plaintiffs is a New York resident, the other is not.

Counsel --

THE COURT: What about the witnesses? What about the businesses? What about the documents? What about the plaintiffs? They're all in New York.

MR. ALLINGHAM: Your Honor, in dealing with

Proceedings

transaction cases like this, everyone understands that you go where the evidence is.

THE COURT: You go where the evidence is, but New York has tremendous interest in this as well.

MR. ALLINGHAM: And the burden on parties will be absolutely no different in going to where the evidence is, with one exception, your Honor.

The hearing would be held in the court of chancery. In Delaware, which has a powerful interest in the application of its corporate law to corporations incorporated in Delaware, which comports with the expectations of the parties who incorporate there and the investors who buy shares in Delaware corporations.

Now, that is not to say, your Honor, that your Honor, if not fully capable of deciding Delaware corporate law questions. We all know that you are.

Courts all over the country all the time apply the law of other states.

But it does mean that Delaware has a uniquely powerful interest in the application of its law to corporations, the internal affairs document, your Honor is familiar with.

And the question then becomes, where does the principle of comity direct us? If a New York law case were presented to the Court of Chancery, we know

that --

 2

1.2

THE COURT: As I said, I don't really think this is a strongest argument for you, given the fact that every court probably, probably every court in the country deals with Delaware corporations and Delaware law, but certainly New York time and again has to deal with this.

This is sort of the immediate and potatoes of the commercial division, so I don't really think, just that this is a strong argument, but --

MR. ALLINGHAM: Let me come back to the convenience issue, your Honor. We all should -- I think we all agree that there should not be two simultaneous procedures with all the risks that are attendant on that: Inconsistent results, additional burden, additional counsel, the works.

So, the question is where should we proceed?

In terms of the convenience, the depositions are going to be taken wherever the witnesses are, and it doesn't matter where the case is pending. That's where they're going to be.

The documents are going to be delivered electronically to the plaintiff's counsel wherever they may be, and there is no burden.

THE COURT: In New York.

Proceedings

MR. ALLINGHAM: But it's electronic delivery.

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. ALLINGHAM: It's electronic delivery.

By the way, both counsel have offices elsewhere. They're not only in New York. I happen to be a member of the Delaware bar, and have been involved in this transaction from the start.

So it is an overstatement to say all the witnesses will be found in Manhattan. It's just not the case.

But my point is, in a transaction, in a deal case like this, the case will proceed the same way and the burdens will be the same right up to the final hearing, and then it's an Amtrak train ride down to Wilmington.

Where you have -- I take your Honor's point, but where you have the interest recognized by our courts of Delaware courts in addressing issues of Delaware law, the State of Delaware has a powerful interest in that issue.

Where you have this case fully tee'd up and an entered scheduling order and with a class certified in which these plaintiffs are already members and can intervene if they didn't like the way their interests are being represented, then I would submit to your

Proceedings

Honor that the -- I don't mean to trivialize it, but the cost of train tickets to Wilmington should hardly be the deciding factor.

THE COURT: Okay, let me hear from the other side.

MR. KERR: Thank you, your Honor.

On the first argument about the Delaware case being more advanced, the main reason why that's the case is because the defendants are cooperating in Delaware. They're not cooperating here.

For example, they say that they filed the answer to the complaint in Delaware.

Well, their answer was due here, and they never filed it. We didn't hear from them.

THE COURT: Did you do anything?

MR. KERR: We called them and said, you know, your answer is due. They said, give us --

THE COURT: Did you come to court to do anything?

MR. KERR: No, we did not. As a courtesy we called counsel and told them that, your answer is due. What's going on?

They asked for an extension until August 1, which we gave them, and in the meantime they filed this motion to stay our case.

So the fact that the answer wasn't filed, their answer would have been filed here had they done so timely.

THE COURT: I understand, but you also did nothing to move this case along.

MR. KERR: Well, I don't know if that's accurate either, your Honor, because as soon as the second case was filed here, we promptly moved for consolidation back in July.

So the fact that the cases are consolidated in Delaware but not here, we asked for that relief two months ago and because there were scheduling issues, that was put off until now.

As far as far as the discovery taking place, we have served discovery requests, we have served the financial advisers here in New York.

The discovery was delayed both in Delaware and New York until the deal was announced just this week. So the idea that somehow discovery is so far out ahead in Delaware and it's not here, my guess is they haven't produced any documents in Delaware yet.

If they did, they probably did so just this week. I don't know if we can get an answer on that.

My expectation is that no documents have been exchanged.

l.

Proceedings

Certainly no depositions have taken place, and the same requests were served in Delaware that were served here.

On the class certification issue, that just happened. My guess is, again, that class certifications were stipulated to or not opposed by the defendants in Delaware, which led to it being granted down there. So I don't think that that's a very compelling argument.

On the interest, as your Honor pointed out, one of the plaintiffs is here. The defendants are here. The reason why the discovery is here is because the conduct occurred here, which I think far outweighs whatever interests the Delaware court is going to have in applying the law.

Finally, I do seem to raise this idea about cases going on in two different tracks. We said in our papers that we would work with Delaware. We don't want to do the same exact thing twice.

First of all, the documents are just an extra copy. On the depositions, we're not saying that we're going to take the same exact deposition and waste everyone's time.

The idea is we're rightfully here. The only edge in Delaware is the fact that they filed a couple

days before us.

The only other difference is the defendants like Delaware more than they like New York, which is why there appears to be progress.

So we would suggest that the appropriate rule here is that, rather than dismissing us or staying us, that your Honor enter an order that says we coordinate with Delaware, which we're happy to do, as no one is interested in doing things twice, wasting everyone's time.

Your Honor, I think it worked in other cases.

It worked in the New York Stock Exchange merger case.

The parties in New York worked with Delaware. I was involved in the case, and it worked.

THE COURT: Well, that only happened -- what happened when I got the case -- and I sort of forced the hand in that, but it was a much more -- it was a case in which there were more New York actions than Delaware actions there and, surprisingly enough, there the defendants and the Delaware court were arguing that it didn't matter which action was first filed, although in that case the New York actions came way before the Delaware actions, and we had more actions here than in Delaware, and neither case was further ahead at that point, and it got moved, and I just felt that was a

fair thing to do.

Frankly, I'm ready to rule on this. At this point, you know, just looking at all the factors, again, I do not think there is such a burden on this court. I do not think there is such a burden to determine the law because we determine in this court Delaware law all the time. So, there is no burden on the court.

I think New York has an interest here, basically, because one of the companies is traded on the New York exchange, and the companies do business in New York. The witnesses are here; the documents are here.

We have a tremendous interest just by the fact that business is done here.

Hardships in litigating: I don't think there is a hardship here. There probably isn't a hardship in Delaware either.

As I said, I don't think -- because of what I said, I don't think there is a jurisdiction on Delaware or New York with greater interest, that both states have a tremendous interest, and there is no burden on the New York court.

There are two things that disturb the court tremendously. One is that the Delaware case is much

б

Proceedings

advanced to this case, and nothing was done to push this case by the plaintiffs.

The other thing is that there would be a tremendous potential for inconsistent verdicts. In the New York Stock Exchange case we did -- I did issue CMOs coordinating everything, but that was at the very beginning of the case.

This case has already started and gone very quickly in Delaware. It has not started here.

So I think there is a difference there. I'm not sure that the Delaware court would agree to hold joint hearings, so the verdicts could possibly be consistent.

I've done that with other Federal courts in other matters. That did not happen in the New York Stock Exchange case. I don't believe the Delaware court was amenable to that.

They probably wouldn't be amenable to that here either, so there is really a tremendous potential for inconsistent rulings, which is a very disturbing factor because we're dealing with the exact same case, and we can't have inconsistent rulings.

I don't think, if this court dismissed these cases, the two cases here, Feit as well as this case, that there would be any prejudice because the

1,9

Proceedings

plaintiffs are represented, and they could intervene in the Delaware case, and I don't believe Feit would dismiss, I wouldn't dismiss with prejudice.

I would dismiss on condition that the plaintiffs be permitted to intervene in Delaware and start an action there if they wanted to.

So, at this point what I am going to do is I am going to deny the motion to consolidate and to appoint interim lead counsel or co-lead counsel here, and I am going to grant the motion to dismiss in this case.

I believe that's just the best thing to do in this case, and it's the fairest and the most just thing to do, so that this case can proceed as quickly as possible.

This shall constitute the decision and order of the court.

MR. ALLINGHAM: Thank you, your Honor.

(End of proceedings)

 $_4$ CERTIFIED TO BE A TRUE AND ACCURATE TRANSCRIPT OF THE ORIGINAL STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES TAKEN OF THIS б PROCEEDING. Barbara Strok BARBARA STROH, CSR, CMR, CRR Senior Court Reporter 1.5

	1	accurate [1] - [4:8	apply [1] - 10:18	burdons pj - 12:14	co (3) - 3:18, 4:15,
	·	ACCURATE[1] -	applying (ŋ - 15:16	business (3) - 9:10,	19:10
		20:5	appoint (4 - 19:10	17:12, 17:16	co-lead [3] - 3:18,
1	[2] - 2:9, 13:24	action [8] - 3:2, 3:3,	appointed [2] - 3:18,	businesses [1] -	4:15, 19:10
10) (1) - 7:9	4:15, 8:26, 9:3, 16:22,	4:15	9:24	pomity [1] - 10:25
10	00 19-6064 (1) - 2:17	19:7	appropriate [1] -	buy [1] - 10:14	commenced (6) -
10	0019-6099 (1) - 2:13	actions (45) - 3:7,	16:6	BY [4] - 2:6, 2:10,	3:10, 3:14, 5:15, 5:16,
16	0 023 թլ - 2:5	3:8, 3:10, 3:14, 3:16,	approved [1] - 7:15	2:14, 2:18	5:17
11	(00 թյ - 2:9	3:22, 3:23, 4:19, 5:16,	arguing (1) - 16:21	BYORUM(4) - 1:10	commercial(i) -
12	2 86 (1) - 2:17	16:19, 16:20, 16:23,	argument (8) - 4;24,	Byorum (1) - 2:12	11:10
13	3 [2] - 5:21, 6:23	16:24	4:26, 8:21, 9:16, 11:4,		committee (3) - 6:24,
	4(1) - 3:12	actual (2) - 6:18,	11:11, 13:8, 15:10	C	7:11, 7:15
14	4th [1] - 5:22	7:19	arguments (1) - 5:3		- compantes (4) - 9:8,
	5 [1] - 1:19	addition pj - 8:5	ARPS (1) - 2:7		9:9, 17:11, 17:12
	8th [1] - 5:22	additional[2]	Arps (1) - 5:8	capable [1] - 10:16	company [1] - 8:2
	9 [1] - 7:24	11:16, 11:17	arrived [1] - 7:14	CARL (1) - 1:12	compalling (i) -
	9899 [1] - 2:9	address (r) - 9:19	aspects (1) - 7:22	caso (37) - 3:4, 3:5,	15:10
		addressed [1] - 7:26	attendant pt - 11:16	6:8, 6:14, 7:22, 7:25,	complaint (2) - 6:16,
i	2	addressing (1) -	Attorneys [4] - 2:4,	9:6, 10:25, 11:21,	13:13
ļ	~	: 12:19	2:8, 2:12, 2:16	12:11, 12:13, 12:22,	comports [i] - 10:12
i		advanced [3] - 6:13,	August [1] - 13:24	13:8, 13:10, 13:26,	condition pg - 19:5
24	911 _[1] - 1:19	13:9, 18:2	Avenue (3) - 2:5,	14:6, 14:9, 16:13,	conductin - 15:14
23	3 [1] - 3:12	advisers (2) - 7:11,	2:13, 2:17	16:15, 16:17, 16:19,	considered [1] - 8:6
2	3th {1] - 5:22	14:17	2,179, 2 ,111	16:23, 16:25, 17:26,	consistent m -
ļ		affairs pj - 10:22	, i В	18:2, 18:3, 18:6, 18:8,	18:14
i	4	ago(1) - 14:13	L .	18:9, 18:17, 18:22,	consolidate [2] - 3:4,
:		agree (s) - 4:22,		18:25, 19:3, 19:12,	19:9
	99 D.C	11:14, 18:12	background (1) -	19:14, 19:15	consolidated (4) -
. 41	88 (դ - 2:5	ahead(3) - 9:4,	6:22	cases (8) - 4:6, 4:26,	3:17, 4:10, 6:16,
	-	14:20, 16:25	bank [1] - 7:8	10:2, 14:11, 15:18,	14:11
	5	- allegations (1) - 4:6	barլոյ - 12:7	16:12, 18:25	consolidation [4] -
i		ALLINGHAM [18] -	BARBARA (2) - 2:21,	Centre (1) - 1:18	3:26, 4:10, 6:15,
5	4 [1] - 1:4	2:10, 3:20, 4:22, 4:25,	20:9	certainly (2) - 11:7,	14:10
•		- 6:4, 5:7, 5:25, 6:9,	BARRY (1) - 1:11	15:2	constitute (1) - 19:17
į	6	7:4, 8:20, 8:22, 9:17,	BE [1] - 20:5	certification [2] -	convenience (2) -
		9:26, 10:6, 11:12,	become րդ - 3:3	8:6, 15:5	11:13, 11:19
		12:2, 12:4, 19:19	becomes [r] - 10:24	certifications [1] -	cooperating [2] -
6	0 [2] - 1:18, 6:21	Allingham [1] - 5:7	Beokman [1] - 2:16	! 15:7	13:10, 13:11
6	51707/2011 [1] -	almost [1] - 9:11	BEEKMAN (5) - 1:10	CERTIFIED [1] - 20:5	coordinate (1) - 16:8
1:1	7	amenable [2] -	BEFORE (1) - 1:20	certified (3) - 8:7,	coordinating (1)
		18:18, 18:19	beginning _[1] - 18:8	8:8, 12:23	18:7
	7	Amoricas (II) - 2:17	behalf (1) - 1:6	Chancellor 2 -	сору [1] - 15:22
		Amtrak (1) - 12:15	best [4] - 19:13	7:20, 8:5	CORP (5) - 1:9
7	07 m 2:42	analysis (2) - 7:8,	better [1] - 5:2	chancery [1] - 10:10	corporate (2) -
,	87 (1) - 2:13	7:10	between [2] - 3:11,	Chancory (2) - 8:23,	10:11, 10:17
	•	AND [1] - 20:5	6:4	: 10:26	corporations (4) -
	8	announced [4] -	Bevina jaj - 2:8, 5:9	; CHARLES [i] - 1:10	10:11, 10:14, 10:22,
		6:23, 7:18, 7:20,	BEVINS (1) - 1:10	L chartored (1) - 9:9	11:6
: B	[1] - 7:9	1 14:19	board (2) - 6:26, 7:16	class [14] - 3:2, 3:3,	COSENZA [1] - 2:14
•	• •	announcement 1] -	breaks (1) - 8:3	3:7, 4:19, 6:15, 8:6,	cost [1] - 13:3
:	9	: 6:18	Brian [1] - 4:3	8:7, 8:8, 8:11, 8:12,	counsel(14) - 3:18,
i	Ť	answer(8) - 5:10,	BRIAN [1] - 2:6	12:23, 15:5, 15:6	4:14, 4:15, 7:7, 8:11,
!		13:13, 13:14, 13:18,	brief (n) - 9:18	clear [3] - 4:5, 4:20,	8:13, 8:15, 9:22,
9	;30լդ - 7:24	13:22, 14:2, 14:3,	brought(1) - 5:2	6:3	11:17, 11:24, 12:5,
	_	14:24	BROWER [1] - 2:4	client (1) - 6:23	13:22, 19:10
!	Α	answers (1) - 6:16	Brower (1) - 4:3	clien(s _[1] - 7:12	Counsel [4] - 2:6,
•		APPEARANCES[1] -	BRUCE [1] - 1:12	close (3) - 3:14, 5:16,	2:10, 2:14, 2:18
_	bsolutely (i) - 10:7	2:3	burden (7) - 10:6.	8:3	country (2) - 10:18,
	-	application [2] -	11:17, 11:25, 17:5,	CMOs (§) - 18:6	. 11:6
	ecomplish (2) - 9:2, :	10:11, 10:21	17:6, 17:8, 17:23	CMR [2] - 2:21, 20:9	COUNTY (1) = 1:4
9:3	,	10.11, 10.21	17.0, 17.0, 17.23		Account the Pa

couple [1] - 15:26 course (1) - 9:2 COURT (27) - 1:3, 2:22, 3:2, 3:21, 4:2, 4:9, 4:13, 4:17, 4:24, 4:26, 5:6, 5:13, 6:6, 7:2, 8:19, 8:21, 9:7, 9.23, 10:4, 11:3, 11:26, 12:3, 13:5, 13:16, 13:19, 14:5, 16:16 court [18] - 7:7, 7:24, 9:3, 10:9, 11:5, 13:19, 15:15, 16:21, 17:8, 17:7, 17:9, 17:24, 17:25, 18:12, 18:18, 18:24, 19:18 Court [8] - 8:22, 10:26, 20:9 court's (1) - 5:17 courtesy [9] - 13:21 courfhouse (1) courts (6) - 4:20, 5:12, 10:18, 12:19, 18:15 cross (2) - 3:19 cross-motion[1] cross-motions (1) -3:19 CRR (2) - 2:21, 20:9 CSR (2) - 2:21, 20:9

D

DANIEL (t) - 2:18 DAWSON [1] - 1:10 Dawson [3] - 2:16 days [1] - 16:2 deadfines (i) - 7:22 deal [3] - 11:7, 12:12, 14:19 dealing (2) - 9:26. 18:22 deals [1] - 11:6 December [1] - 7:24 deciding [2] - 10:16, decision (1) - 19:17 decisions (1) - 4:21 defendants (8) - 3:5, 13:10, 15:8, 15:12, 16:3, 16:21 Defendants [4] • 1:14, 2:8, 2:12, 2:16 defendants* (i) - 4:7 Delaware (52) - 2:9, 3:7, 3:22, 5:2, 6:11,

10:16, 10:20, 11:6, 12:7, 12:19, 12:20, 13:8, 13:11, 13:13, 14:12, 14:18, 14:21, 14:22, 15:3, 15:8, 15:15, 15:19, 15:26, 16:4, 16:9, 16:14, 16:20, 16:21, 16:24, 16:25, 17:8, 17:19, 17:21, 17:26, 18:10, 18:12, 18:17, 19:3, 19:6 delayed [1] - 14:18 delivered pg - 11:23 delivery [2] - 12:2, deny (f) - 19:9 deposition (t) depositions (3) -11:19, 15:2, 15:22 determine [3] - 6:8, 17:7 difference [2] - 16:3, 18:11 different [4] - 4:20, 4:21, 10:7, 16:18 diligence (1) - 7:10 DINH pg - 1:11 Dinh [g - 2:12 direct[1] - 10:25 directors (2) - 7:3, 7:8 discovery (e) - 6:17, 14:15, 14:16, 14:18, 14:20, 15:13 dismiss (5) - 3:21, 19:4, 19:5, 19:11 dismissed [1] -18:24 dismissing η - 16:7 dispute [1] - 8:14 distinguish [1] - 6:4 distinguished [1] -8:14 disturb (1) - 17:25 disturbing (4) -18:21 division (1) - 11:10 document[i] - 10:22 documents [7] -9:12, 9:24, 11:23, 14:22, 14:25, 15:21,

17:13

done (4) - 14:3,

17:16, 18:2, 18:15

doubt [1] - 8:16

6:12, 6:14, 7:25, 8:26,

10:10, 10:12, 10:14,

9:2, 9:3, 9:5, 9:9,

| down [2] - 12:15, 15:9 | due [4] - 7:10, 13:14, 13:18, 13:22

Ε

edge (1) - 15:26 Eighth (1) - 2:5 elther (4) - 3:21, 14:8, 17:19, 18:20 electronic [2] - 12:2, 12:4 electronically (1) -11:24 elsewhere [i] - 12:8 end (a) - 8:2, 8:4, 19:21 enter (t) - 16:8 entered (3) - 7:21, 8:9, 12:23 equally [1] - 8:14 ESQ[4] - 2:6, 2:10, 2:14, 2:18 estabilshment [1] -6:16 evidence jaj - 10:3, 10:4, 10:8 exact [3] - 15:20, 15:23, 18:22 examined (1) - 7:11 example [1] - 13:12 exception [1] - 10:8 exchange (1) - 17:12 Exchange (5) - 7:5, 9;11, 16:13, 18:6, 18:17 exchanged[ii] -14:26 expectation [1] -14:25 expectations [4] -10:13 extension (1) - 13:24 extra [9] - 15:21

F

fact [7] - 8:7, 8:10, 11:4, 14:2, 14:11, 15:26, 17:15 factor [8] - 5:24, 13:4, 18:22 factors [9] - 6:3, 6:5, 17:4 facts [1] - 9:17 falr [2] - 6:9, 17:2

fairest [1] - 19:14

familiar [1] - 10:23 fer(4) - 14:15, 14:20, 15:14 FARR (1) - 2:11 Farr(2) - 6:25, 7:7 fashion [1] - 7:26 favor [i] - 3:22 Federal (1) - 18:15 Feit[3] - 4:14, 18:25, felt[1] - 16:26 file (1) - 5:22 Med (13) - 5:12, 5:14, 5:22, 6:2, 6:20, 13:12, 13:15, 13:25, 14:2, 14:3, 14:9, 15:26, 16:22 final [9] - 7:13, 7:23, 12:14 finally [1] - 15:17 financial (η - 14:17 firm (1) - 5:21 first (e) - 5:12, 5:14, 5:26, 6:11, 9:17, 9:20, 13:8, 15:21, 16:22 FLOM pg - 2:7 Ficor[4] - 2:5 FOLZ[1] - 1:11 Forbes (3) ~ 2:8, 5:8, FORBES [1] - 1:12 forced (s) - 16:17 formed [1] - 6:25 forth [5] - 7:11 forum (5) - 6:11, 6:12, 6:13, 8:25 forums [1] - 6:4 four (1) - 3:7 frankly [2] - 6:6, 17:3 friends (2) - 8:13, 9:18 fully [3] - 8:26,

G

10:16, 12:22

GALLAGHER [1] - 2:11 game [1] - 9:4 GARRISON [3] - 2:15 general [1] - 5:11 given [1] - 11:4 goal [1] - 9:2 grant [1] - 19:11 granted [1] - 15:8 greater [1] - 17:22 guess [1] - 3:17, 3:19, 14:21, 15:6

hand[i] - 16:18 happy [1] - 16:9 hardly (1) - 13:3 hardship [2] - 17:18 hardships (1) - 17:17 hear [5] - 3:24, 4:17, 5:6, 13:5, 13:15 hearing (3) - 7:24, 10:9, 12:15 hearings (1) - 18:13 held [1] - 10:9 hlgher(1) - 7:18 hold [1] - 18:12 HOLDINGS [1] - 1:13 Honor [23] - 3:20, 3:25, 4:5, 4:23, 5:5, 5:7, 5:10, 6:9, 6:19, 8:24, 9:26, 10:8, 10:15, 10:16, 10:22, 11:13, 13:2, 13:7,

14:8, 15:11, 16:8,

Honore III - 12:17

HONORABLE [1] -

16:12, 19:19

1:21

H

idea pr - 14:20. 15:17, 15:25 identical [1] - 8:7 ignore [1] - 5:24 immediate (1) - 11:9 INC pp - 1:13 Inconsistent (4) -11:16, 18:5, 18:21, 18:23 incorporate [1] -10:13 incorporated [2] -9:8, 10:12 Independent (3) -7:2, 7:6, 7:7 Index (1) - 1:17 Individually pg - 1:6 Injunction (1) - 7:23 intensive (1) - 7:9 Interest [12] - 9.8, 9:15, 10:5, 10:10, 10:21, 12:18, 12:21, 16:11, 17:10, 17:15, 17:22, 17:23 interested (1) - 16:10 interests (4) - 8:11, 8:17, 12:25, 15:15 interior [3] - 3:17,

4:15, 19:10 internal [1] - 10:22 Intervene [6] - 8:19, 8:20, 8:23, 12:25, 19:2, 19:6 Interviews [1] - 7:10 Investment [1] - 7:8 Investors [1] - 10:14 involved [7] - 12:7, 18:15 Involving [3] - 3:5, 3:8, 3:9 Issue [6] - 5:15, 9:6, 11:13, 12:21, 15:5,

J

issues (5) - 3:6, 5:26,

6:7, 9:6, 12:19, 14:13

JOHN [1] - 1:11 Joint [1] - 18:13 July [1] - 14:10 June [9] - 3:11, 3:12, 5:21, 6:23 Jurisdiction [1] -17:21 Justice [1] - 1:22

Κ

KEANE [1] - 1:11 Keane [1] - 2:16 Kerr [1] - 4:3 KERR [9] - 2:6, 3:25, 4:3, 4:12, 4:16, 13:7, 13:17, 13:21, 14:7 KORNREICH [1] -1:21

L

last (1) - 7:13 law (11) - 5:21, 10:11, 10:17, 10:18, 10:21, 10:25, 11:7, 12:20, 15:16, 17:7, 17:8 lead (4) - 3:18, 4:15, 19:10 leads (2) - 7:21, 7:23 led (1) - 15:8 LEFELL (1) - 2:18 litigate (4) - 8:25 litigating (1) - 17:17 LLP (2) - 2:7, 2:15 looking (4) - 17:4

М

M&F (2) - 1:9, 2:16

Macandrews (3) -

Madea (1) - 6:25

Madison (1) - 2:5

managed թթ - 5:21

main [1] - 13:9

MACANDREWS (1) -

2:8, 5:8, 6:26

1:12

management [4] -7:10 Manhattan (1) -12:10 Market [1] - 2:9 MARTHA [1] - 1:10. matter [4] - 3:8, 3:9, 11:21, 16:22 matters (i) - 18:16 MEAGHER [1] - 2:7 mean (a) - 4:18, 4:24, 10:20, 13:2 meantime [1] - 13:25 meet [1] - 4:9 Meister (1) - 2:12 MEISTER [1] - 1:11 member [1] - 12:7 members (2) - 8:10, 12:24 merely [1] - 7:20 njerger (1) - 16:13 MICHAEL[1] - 1:6 might [2] - 6:21, 8:3 mind (1) - 5:17 MINUTES (1) - 20:6 Monday [1] - 7:17 months [1] - 14:13 morning(s) - 7:17 most[ii] - 19:14 Motion [1] - 1:18 motion (c) - 3:4, 3:19, 3:26, 13:26, 19:9, 19:11 motions [2] - 3:19, 8:23 move [1] - 14:6 moved [2] - 14:9, 16:28 MR (25) - 3:20, 3:25, 4:3, 4:12, 4:16, 4:22,

4:25, 5:4, 5:7, 5:25,

6:9, 7:4, 8:20, 8:22,

9:17, 9:26, 10:6,

11:12, 12:2, 12:4,

13:7, 13:17, 13:21,

14:7, 19:19

Ν

named (2) - 9:13, 9:20 negotiations (1) -7:14 nover[1] - 13:15 new (1) - 7:17 NEW [2] - 1:3, 1:4 New [41] - 1:18, 2:5, 2:13, 2:17, 3:8, 3:16, 3:22, 4:9, 4:11, 5:11, 7:5, 9:10, 9:11, 9:12, 9:13, 9:15, 9:21, 9:25, 10:5, 10:25, 11:7, 11:26, 12:6, 14:17, 14:19, 16:4, 16:13, 16:14, 16:19, 16:23, 17:10, 17:12, 17:13, 17:22, 17:24, 18:6, 18:16 next(1) - 7:9 nothing (2) - 14:6, 18:2 notice (1) - 5:20

0

objective [2] - 5:11, 6:2 occurred [2] - 5:21, 15:14 OF (5) - 1:3, 1:4, 20:6 offices m - 12:5 OFFICIAL[1] - 2:22 one [12] - 3:11, 3:13, 5:21, 5:26, 8:25, 9:10, 9:20, 10:8, 15:12, 16:9, 17:11, 17:26 one-week [1] - 3:11 operative [1] - 6:16 opposed (2) - 7:19, 15:7 opposition [1] - 4:8 option [1] - 8:18 order [5] - 7:21, 8:8, 12:23, 16:8, 19:17 ORIGINAL (1) - 20:6 original(1) - 3:26 outweighs [i] -15:14 overstatement [1] -12:9 own [1] - 7:8

P

P.C [1] - 2:4

papers (2) - 6:19, 16:19 PART(1) - 1:4 particularly [1] -8:24 parties [6] - 4:7, 6:17, 6:18, 10:6, 10:13, 16:14 pariners (1) - 7:7 PAUL [2] - 1:11, 2:15 pending (1) - 11:21 people [1] - 8:24 Perelman (2) - 2:8, 5:9 PERELMAN [1] - 1:9 period [1] - 3:11 permitted[1] - 19:6.

PHILIP (1) - 3:10 PIVEN (1) - 2:4 place (2) - 14:15, 15:2 plaintiff (3) - 3:25, 4:4, 8:15 Plaintiff (2) - 1:7, 2:4 plaintiff s (1) - 8:10, 9:13, 9:20, 9:25, 12:24, 15:12, 18:3, 19:2, 19:6 plant(1) - 6:6

pleadings [f] - 9:18 point [g] - 3:16, 12:12, 12:17, 16:26, 17:4, 19:8 pointed [q] - 15:11 position [g] - 4:12, 4:13 possiblo [q] - 19:16 possibly [4] - 18:13 potatoes [5] - 11:9

18:20 powerful(s) - 6:10, 9:6, 10:10, 10:21, 12:20 prejudice p; - 18:26, 19:4 preliminary p; -

potential (2) - 18:5,

preliminary [4] -7:23 presented [3] - 7:16, 9:6, 10:26 price [1] - 7:18 principle [1] - 10:25 procedures [1] -11:15

proceed (s) - 11:18, 12:13, 19:15 PROCEEDING (s) -20:6 proceedings (1) - 19:21
produced (1) - 14:22
progress (1) - 16:5
promptly (1) - 14:9
proposal (1) - 6:19,
6:22, 7:12, 7:20
proposed (1) - 8:8
protected (2) - 8:11,
8:17
push (1) - 18:2
put (1) - 14:14

Q

questions [1] - 10:17 quickly (2) - 18:10, 19:15

R

race [2] - 5:19, 6:7. raise [2] - 4:6, 15:17 rather [1] - 16:7 ready [1] - 17:3 roally [3] - 11:3, 11:10, 18:20 reason [2] - 13:9, 15:13 reasons (2) - 5:4, 6:10 recognized [1] -12:18 relief(); - 14:12 rendering (1) - 4:21 REPORTER(I) -2;22 Reportern - 20:9 represent (1) - 5:8 represented [3] -6:24, 12:26, 19:2 representing (1) -8:12 requests [3] - 6:17, 14:16, 15:3 resident (i) - 9:21 residents [1] - 9:14 results (g - 11:16) retain (1) - 7:6 ride (1) ~ 12:15 RIFKIND (1) - 2:15 rightfully (1) - 15:25 risks (1) - 11:15 RONALDO[i] - 1:9 rule (7) - 5:12, 5:14, 6:2, 7:5, 16:6, 17:3 rules (3) - 5:11, 7:5 rulings [2] - 18:21,

18:23

S

scheduled (1) - 7:26 scheduling (3) -7:21, 12:23, 14:13 Schwartz [2] - 2:8, 5:9 SCHWARTZ(1) second (2) - 9:5, 14:9 soconds [1] - 6:22 seek [1] - 3:16 seeking (2) - 3:21, 4:14 seeks (s) - 3:3 seem (i) - 15:17 Senior (1) - 20:9 September [5] - 1:19 served [4] - 14:16, 15:3, 15:4 set(i) - 7:25 sets (1) - 7;21 Seventh [1] - 2:13 several (2) - 3:21, 5:4 shall [1] - 19:17 shares (i) - 10:14 SHIRLEY [1] - 1;21 side (3) - 4:18, 13:6 sidebar (1) - 8:15 significantly [1] -6:12 similar (3) - 4:8, 4:7 similarly (q - 1:6 simultaneous ## -11:15 situated (1) - 1:6 six [1] - 5:16 SKADDEN [1] - 2:7 Skadden pg - 5:8 SLATE [1] - 2:7 SLOVIN [1] - 1:12 Stovings - 2:16 soon [1] - 14:8 sort [2] - 11:9, 16:17 special [3] - 6:24, 7:11, 7:15 standard [2] - 4:10, start (3) - 5:13, 12:8, started [2] - 18:9, 18:10 STATE (1) - 1:3 State (1) - 12:20

states [2] - 10:19,

17:22 statute (1) - 4:11 stay [2] - 3:22, 13:26 staying [1] - 16:7 STENOGRAPHIC [1] - 20:6 STEPHEN(I) - 1:12 stipulated (i) - 15:7 Stock [6] - 7:5, 9:11, 16:13, 18:6, 18:17 Street [2] - 1:18, 2:9 Strine (2) - 7:20, 8:5 \$TROH (2) - 2:21, 20:9 strong [2] - 9:16, 11:11 strongest |tj = 11:4 structure | i) = 6:15 structured (1) - 7:25 submit (1) - 12:26 suggest (n - 16:6 supposedly [f] - 7:2. SUPREME(1) - 1:3 surprisingly [4] -16:20 sympathetic [1] -8:23

Т

TAKEN (1) - 20:6 Taub (t) ~ 2:16 TAUB (t) - 1:12 tee'd (2) - 8:26, 12:22 TERM () [- 1:4] terms (2) - 5:14, 11:19 THE 1275 - 1:3, 3:2, 3:21, 4:2, 4:9, 4:13, 4:17, 4:24, 4:26, 5:6, 5:13, 6:5, 7:2, 8:19, 8:21, 9:7, 9:23, 10:4, 11:3, 11:26, 12:3, 13:5, 13:16, 13:19, 14:5, 16:16, 20:8 TREO [i] - 1:11 third (1) - 6:17 TBIS (1) - 20:6 THOMAS (i) - 2:10 lickets [1] - 13:3 timely (2) - 7:26, 14:4 TQ [ŋ - 20:5] TODD [1] - 2:14 together m - 8:24 Tom [1] - 5:7 tracks [1] - 15:18 traded [2] - 9:11,

17:11

train [2] - 12:15, 13:3 transaction (8) -6:22, 7:14, 7:17, 7:19, 8:3, 10:2, 12:8, 12:12 TRANSCRIPT (1) -20:5 tremendous (6) -9:15, 10:5, 17:15, 17:23, 18:5, 18:20 tremendously (1) -17:28 TRIAL [1] - 1:4 trivialize [1] - 13:2 TRUE (1) - 20:5 turn (2) - 5:25, 6:6 twice (2) - 15:20, 16:10 two [12] - 3:8, 3:18, 4:5, 5:20, 6:4, 6:10, 9:20, 11:14, 14:12, 15:18, 17:25, 18:25

U

ultimately (1) - 7:15 under [2] - 4:11, 7:4 uniquoly [1] - 10:20 up [4] - 7:25, 8:26, 12:14, 12:22 utility [1] - 6:2

٧

various (17 - 7:22 verdicts (27 - 18:5, 18:13 VIET (17 - 1:11

W

waste [1] - 15:23 wasting [1] - 16:10 Webb (i) - 2:12 WEBB [1] - 1:12 week [6] - 3:11, 3:13, 7:13, 14:19, 14:24 weekend (1) - 7:17 weeks [1] - 7:9 WEISS [1] - 2:15 WERNER [1] - 1:21 WHARTON [1] - 2:15 WILLIAM (1) - 1:10 WILLKIE [1] - 2:11 Willkie (2) - 6:25, 7:8 Wilmington |3| - 2:9, 12:16, 13:3 witnesses [5] - 9:12, 9:23, 11:20, 12:10,

17:13
works | 1] - f1:17
WOREDWIDE | 1] 1:9
Worldwide | s| 2:16, 6:26, 7:16
worthwhite | 1] - 6:21
WRIGHT | 1] - 1:6

Υ

year [3] - 3:11, 8:2, 8:4

yesterday [1] - 8:9

YORK [2] - 1:3, 1:4

York [41] - 1:18, 2:5, 2:13, 2:17, 3:8, 3:16, 3:22, 4:9, 4:11, 5:11, 7:5, 9:10, 9:11, 9:13, 9:15, 9:21, 9:25, 10:5, 10:26, 14:17, 14:19, 16:4, 16:13, 16:14, 16:19, 16:23, 17:10, 17:12, 17:13, 17:22, 17:24, 18:6, 18:16